

## REMARKS

### Status of the Claims

Claims 1-6 have been cancelled, and new claims 7-14 have been added in which claim 7 is an independent claim.

### Supports for the new claims

The data reprocessing device of claim 7 corresponds to mobile phone 40 in the embodiment.

The memory of claim 7 corresponds to memory unit 407 in the embodiment, and it is disclosed, for example, in lines 1-16 of page 7 of the specification.

The processor of claim 7 corresponds to CPU 405 in the embodiment.

The object generator of claim 7 corresponds to a part of the function of generating objects of JAM in the embodiment, and it is disclosed, for example, in lines 11-19 and 25-29 of page 10, lines 1-5 of page 11, and lines 3-4 of page 16, of the specification.

The data access manager of claim 7 corresponds to the function of managing data access of JAM in the embodiment, and it is disclosed, for example, in lines 11-19 and 25-29 of page 10, lines 1-13 of page 11, and lines 12-22 of page 12, of the specification.

The object generation manager of claim 7 corresponds to a part of the function of generating objects of JAM in the embodiment, and it is disclosed, for example, in lines 2-6 of page 16, and lines 4-29 of page 17, of the specification.

The reliability information of claims 8 and 9 corresponds to the trusted application identifier in the embodiment, and it is disclosed, for example, in lines 5-24 of page 8, lines 25-29 of page 21, and line 1 of page 22, of the specification.

The features of claim 8 are disclosed, for example, in lines 12-18 of page 17 of the specification.

The features of claim 9 are disclosed, for example, in lines 18-29 of page 27, and lines 1-7 of page 28, of the specification.

The features of claim 10 are disclosed, for example, in lines 12-29 of page 12, lines 1-11 of page 13, and lines 19-29 of page 17, of the specification.

The features of claim 11 are disclosed, for example, in lines 17-21 of page 21, lines 4-22 of page 22, lines 25-29 of page 23, and lines 1-9 of page 24, of the specification.

The features of claim 12 are disclosed, for example, in lines 18-21 of page 7, lines 12-29 of page 16, and lines 1-3 of page 17, of the specification.

The features of claim 13 are disclosed, for example, in lines 25-29 of page 8, and lines 1-9 of page 9, of the specification.

The features of claim 14 are disclosed, for example, in lines 8-17 of page 15 of the specification.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 112**

With regard to the rejection under 35 USC §112, the problem relating to lack of clarity has been solved in the amended claims.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 103**

With regard to the rejection under 35 USC §103, the applicant respectfully argues that the present invention described in the amended claims are patentable over any combination of the citations Jguru, Lipkin, and Underwood.

Jguru discloses introductory information of CORBA, that is a standard for enabling a terminal to execute an application that requires an object that is not locally stored at the terminal, by letting the terminal access reference data stored at a server via a network, the reference data indicating storage locations of objects in the network, to obtain storage location information of the required object, and obtain the required object by use of the storage location information.

In connection with the present invention, Jguru discloses a sample code defining a class of an object corresponding to an imperfect encapsulated object of the present invention.

Lipkin discloses a system where each of the objects that are accessible via a network are classified into domains having a hierarchical structure, and access right of each of the nodes in the network to each of the objects are determined on the basis of security list defining relationship between the domains.

In connection with the present invention, Lipkin discloses a storage unit that stores data, a processor that executes a program, and a method for fetching (obtaining) an object.

Underwood discloses a system for enabling a global internetworking.

The applicant cannot find any relevance between the present invention and Underwood except that both of the inventions relate to management of data access.

In the office action, it is stated that the idea of 'the high, medium, and low level of reliability' of the present invention was disclosed in col. 204, lines 55-57 of Underwood. Actually, Underwood discloses in col. 204, lines 55-57 that a priority of change request for requesting a change in an e-commerce system of Underwood is categorized into any one of 'high', 'medium', 'low', and 'cosmetic'. Namely, Underwood discloses priority of a request among plural requests that is substantially different from a degree of reliability of an application of the present invention.

None of Jguru, Lipkin, and Underwood discloses nor suggests the features of the object generation manager of claim 7 of the present invention. More specifically, the object generation manager of the present invention allows the object generator to generate an imperfect encapsulated object only when reliability of the application requesting the generation of the object meets a predetermined requirement. In short, in the present invention, based on reliability of an application requesting a generation of an object, it is determined whether the object can be an imperfect object or not. Jguru, Lipkin, and Underwood are silent about the idea of the present invention.

Accordingly, claim 7, and claims 8-14 that are dependent on claim 7, are patentable over Jguru, Lipkin, and Underwood.

Respectfully submitted,

August 20, 2007

Date

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE

P.O. Box 10395

Chicago, IL 60610

(312) 321-4200

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tadashi Horie (Reg. No. 40,437)